DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 327 PS 017 626

AUTHOR Johnson, Jessie
TITLE Language Development Component: All Day Kindergarten Program. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 27p.; For 1986-87 report, see ED 288 179.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Reading; *Extended School Day; *High Risk Students; *Kindergarten Children; *Language Acquisition; Low Achievement; Primary Education; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Full Day Programs; Kindergarten Extended Day Program

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was made of the language development component of Columbus, Ohio's All Day Kindergarten Program (ADKP). The ADKP was instituted in Columbus' public schools in January, 1972, to provide a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The overall goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade by providing an extra half day of instruction to pupils needing additional help and attention. In the 1987-1988 school year, 18 teachers served in 18 Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. Each provided daily instruction for two groups of 15 pupils. For evaluation purposes, the ADKP provided 123 days of instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis attended at least 98 of those days. Data were collected in five areas: (1) pupil census; (2) standardized achievement test scores; (3) teacher census; (4) parent involvement data; and (5) inservice evaluation. The overall normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain for the program averaged 20.3 NCE points for the 6-month treatment or 3.4 NCE points for each month of treatment. Based on the evaluation results, it was strongly recommended that the ADKP be continued in the 1988-1989 school year. Results are discussed and specific steps for improving program effectiveness are described. Pupil and teacher census forms, parent involvement survey forms, and general and orientation inservice evaluation forms are appended. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED301327

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

July 1988

Written by:

Jessie Johnson
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Sharon Bermel
and
Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary Thompson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

PS 017626

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM
1987-88

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The All Day Kindergarten (ADK) Program served 594 pupils. Funding of the program was made available through the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1 of 1983.

The purpose of the Columbus Public Schools in planning the ADK Program was to provide a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The overall goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provided pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operated on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program would better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1987-88 program goal, 18 program teachers served in 18 Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 15 pupils each, for approximately 13.0 hours each week.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 28, 1987 and continued through April 15, 1988. This interval of time gave 123 days of program instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis must have attended at least 98 days (80%) during the time period stated above.

Activities: Implementation of the program was accomplished through daily instructional activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction without pursuing the basic reading readiness textbooks. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase language development and enhance those skills needed to be successful in first grade.

Achievement Objective: The average language/reading growth of pupils in program attendance for at least 80% of the instructional period will be 1.0 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) point for each month of instruction as determined by a nationally standardized achievement test appropriate to program content.

Evaluation Design: The major evaluation effort was accomplished through the administration of the Oral Comprehension Test, Form U, Level A, of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS). Analyses of the data included comparison between pretest and posttest change scores in terms of raw scores, grade equivalents, percentiles, and NCEs.

Major Findings/Recommendations: The information collected on the Pupil Census Forms indicated that the program served 594 pupils for an average of 13.0 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 506.6 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 104.9 days and the average attendance per pupil was 94.1 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 33.0.

The attendance criterion was met by 386 pupils, which was 64.9% of the 594 pupils served. Of these, 366 received both administrations of the achievement test.

The overall NCE gain for the program averaged 20.3 NCE points for the six month treatment or 3.4 NCE points for each month of treatment. The evaluation objective set a goal of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment. Thus, the evaluation objective was met with the average change of 3.4 NCE points for each month of treatment, greatly exceeding the criterion of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment.

The analyses of monthly parent involvement indicated the greatest amount of parent involvement occurred in September, with a total of 492.5 parent hours. The least amount of parent involvement occurred in April, with a total of 70.5 parent hours reported. An unduplicated count of an estimated 679 parents were directly involved with the program. Areas of parent involvement included: (a) planning operation, and/or evaluation; (b) group meetings; (c) individual conferences; (d) classroom visits and field trips; and (e) visits by the program teacher to their homes.

Program teachers attended four inservice meetings during the school year. The meetings which were evaluated received highly positive ratings by program teachers.

The program evaluator collected process data by visiting some project schools. The visitation plan called for the program evaluator to visit program teachers in selected schools and record the results of the evaluator's observations and interviews with the teacher on the Evaluator's Visitation Log. Visitation occurred during the period from March 1 to March 28, 1988. Data gathered regarding evaluation and program concerns were generally found to be satisfactory. Seven of the eight teachers interviewed indicated that the level of communication with cooperating teachers was very good. Coordinating instruction of the reading program was rated as very important and generally occurred on an informal basis. Overall, the data indicated that program teacher efforts at parent involvement were not as successful as desired. Some concerns were expressed regarding the desire for more inservice meetings during the school year to enhance instruction.

Based on the evaluation results, it is strongly recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1988-89 school year, and that consideration be given those skills suggested for teachers to improve instruction and enhance program success. It is also recommended that school visitations be continued next year. These visits provide useful information regarding evaluation concerns and program needs.

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

July 1988

Program Description

The All Day Kindergarten Program was instituted in the Columbus Public Schools in January, 1972, for the purpose of providing a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. The overall goal of the program is to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provides pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operates on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program will better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1987-88 program goal, 18 program teachers served in 18 Chapter 1 eligible elementary schools. The schools are listed below.

Avondale	Lincoln Park	Reeb
Beck	Linden	Second Ave.
Dana	Livingston	Sullivant
East Columbus	Main	Trevitt
Highland	Medary	West Broad
Kent	Ohio	Windsor

Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 15 pupils each.

Evaluation Objective

The evaluation objective for the ADK program was as follows:

The average language/reading growth of pupils in program attendance for at least 80% of the instructional period will be 1.0 NCE point for each month of instruction as determined by a nationally standardized achievement test appropriate to program content.

For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 28, 1987 and continued through April 15, 1988. This interval of time gave 123 days of program instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis must have attended at least 98 days (80%) during the time period stated above.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the All Day Kindergarten program called for the collection of data in five areas. A copy of each instrument is found in the Appendix, with the exception of the standardized achievement test.

1. ECIA Chapter 1 Pupil Census Information

   A Pupil Census Form was completed by program teachers for each pupil served to provide the following information: days of program enrollment, days of program attendance, and hours of instruction per week. The form also includes information on the pupil's grade and sex. Collection of these forms was completed in April 1988.

2. Standardized Achievement Test Information

   The instrument used to assess pupil progress in language was the Oral Comprehension Test (Form U, Level A) of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTB/McGraw-Hill staff members, 1981). This test which is published by CTB/McGraw-Hill has empirical norms for fall and spring established in October 1980 and April 1981. The program pupils were pretested the week of September 21, 1987 and posttested the week of April 18, 1988.

3. ECIA Chapter 1 Teacher Census Information

   The Teacher Census Form was designed to provide information regarding the characteristics of program personnel. Data from this form included number of years of teaching experience, number of years of Title I and/or Chapter 1 teaching experience, highest college degree attained, and whether the teacher's teaching certificate includes certification in Reading as a subject area. The forms were completed by the program teachers and collected at the Chapter 1 teachers' orientation meeting held September 8, 1987.

4. Parent Involvement Information

   The Parent Involvement Survey was designed to provide information on involvement of parents with ECIA Chapter 1 programs, as required in the Annual Chapter 1, ECIA, Evaluation Report. It was filled out monthly by all program teachers. Monthly data included number of parents and number of hours involved in five categories of parent involvement, including a monthly unduplicated count of parents involved. In addition, a yearly unduplicated count of parents was collected at the end of the school year.

5. Inservice Evaluation Information

The General Inservice Evaluation Form was constructed locally to collect information about the effectiveness of the inservice meetings as well as provide feedback to the program administrators.

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained in a series of on-site visits to program classrooms during the period from March 1 to March 28, 1988. An Evaluator's Visitation Log was completed during each classroom visit to record the results of the evaluator's observations and interview with the teacher. The Log was designed to record pertinent information regarding record keeping, communication, pupil selection procedures, evaluation feedback, and facilities and program materials, as well as to increase the familiarity of the program evaluator with the workings of the program.

Major Findings

The information collected on the Pupil Census Forms is summarized in Table 1. The program served 594 pupils for an average of 13.0 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 506.6 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 104.9 days and the average attendance per pupil was 94.1 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 33.0.

The evaluation sample was comprised of those pupils who attended 80% of the program days and who received both a pretest and a posttest. The attendance criterion was met by 386 pupils, which was 64.9% of the 594 pupils served. Of these, 366 received both administrations of the achievement test. Data from testing are presented in Tables 2-6.

The analyses of pretest-posttest achievement data for raw score minimums, maximums, averages, and standard deviations are shown in Table 2. The average number of items correct on the posttest was 11.4 which is an average increase of 4.3 items or 28.7% increase of the 15 item test.

Pretest-posttest percentile data are presented in Table 3. The median percentile for the pretest was 14.0, which was well below the 36th percentile. Percentile scores on the posttest ranged from 1%ile to 96%ile with a median of 50.

Table 1

Number of Pupils Served; Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week; and Pupils Attending 80% of Days

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days of Enrollment	Average Days of Attendance	Average Daily Membership	Average Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week	Pupils Attending 80% of Days
K	594	276	318	104.9	94.1	506.6	13.0	386

Table 2

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the Pretest and Posttest Raw Scores

Grade	Number of Test Items	Number of Pupils	Pretest Min.	Pretest Max.	Pretest Average Correct	Pretest Standard Deviation	Posttest Min.	Posttest Max.	Posttest Average Correct	Posttest Standard Deviation	Average Change
K	15	366	0	14	7.1	2.4	4	15	11.4	2.3	4.3

Table 4 presents pretest and posttest data in terms of grade equivalents. It should be noted that a grade equivalent of 0.0 for kindergarten can be deceptive, as it does not allow for those pupils functioning at the pre-kindergarten level. Thus the comparison of pretest and posttest median grade equivalents in kindergarten is a very conservative comparison due to the ambiguity of the 0.0 grade equivalent score. The average grade equivalent on the posttest was 0.9, a positive change during the six month treatment period.

The presentation of achievement data thus far has included results from the analysis of raw scores, percentiles, and grade equivalents. Raw scores are equal units of measurement, but can only provide a limited interpretation of achievement data. Percentiles and grade equivalents provide comparative information but are not equal units of measure. Caution is advised in drawing conclusions about program impact from any of the scores above. Normal curve equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement, since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for normal curve equivalents are presented in Table 5.

The overall NCE gain for the program averaged 20.3 NCE points for the six month treatment period or 3.4 NCE points for each month of treatment. The evaluation objective set a goal of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment. Thus the evaluation objective was met with the average change of 3.4 NCE points for each month of treatment greatly exceeding the criterion of 1.0 NCE point for each month of treatment.

Table 6 contains data related to changes in NCE scores for three ranges: (a) no improvement in NCE scores (0.0 or less); (b) some improvement in NCE scores (0.1 to 6.9); and (c) substantial improvement in NCE scores (7.0 or more). The data indicate that 310 (84.7%) pupils made gains in NCE scores. More specifically, 274 (74.9%) made substantial improvement and 36 (9.8%) made some improvement in NCE scores, and 56 (15.3%) made no improvement, as evidenced by a gain of 0.0 or decrease in NCE score.

Analysis of the Teacher Census Form data revealed that of the 18 program teachers, 7 teachers had Master's degrees and the other 11 had Bachelor's degrees. Two teachers had certification in Reading as a subject area. The average years of total teaching experience was 18.7, with 10.8 of Title I/Chapter 1 teaching.

Monthly involvement of program parents is summarized in Table 7. If total parent hours per month are used as a basis of comparison, the greatest degree of parent involvement occurred in September, with a total of 492.5 parent hours. The least degree of parent involvement appeared to occur in April, with a total of 70.5 parent hours reported. The number of parents involved is not additive, since a parent could be involved in more than one activity across months. Therefore, a yearly unduplicated count of parents who were involved with the program was collected from program teachers at the end of the school year. The annual unduplicated count of parents was estimated at 679.

Table 3

Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation
K	366	3	89	14.0	16.4	1	96	50.0	27.6

Table 4

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Grade Equivalents (GE)

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest				Average Change
		Min.	Max.	Average GE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average GE	Standard Deviation	
K	366	0	2.6	0.0*	0.2	0	2.9	0.9	1.0	0.9

*In grade K, the comparison of pretest and posttest scores is a very conservative one, due to the fact that a score of 0.0 can represent not only those pupils functioning at beginning kindergarten level, but also those functioning at pre-kindergarten level.

Table 5

Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)

Grade	Number of Pupils	Pretest				Posttest				Average Change
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
K	366	12	75.0	27.9	13.2	1	87.0	48.2	19.4	20.3

Table 6

Changes in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) Scores
for All Day Kindergarten Pupils
1987-88

	Pupils in Sample	No. Improvement (0.0 or less)	Some Improvement (0.1 to 6.9)	Substantial Improvement (7.0 or more)
Number of Pupils	366	56	36	274
% of Pupils		15.3%	9.8%	74.9

Table 7

Number of Parents Involved
and Total Parent Hours
Reported by Month

Items	Months									
	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation and/or evaluation of your unit										
Number of Parents	0	4	21	3	4	2	5	5	8	9
Total Parent Hours	0	13.5	12	4.5	4	1	4	2	7	8
2. Group meetings for parents										
Number of Parents	485	156	95	42	18	35	32	25	22	22
Total Parent Hours	429	121	96	52	18	29	44	16	24	12
3. Individual parent conferences										
Number of Parents	126	112	212	54	84	184	75	82	65	49
Total Parent Hours	54	44	121	20.5	32	63	26	26	24	15.5
4. Parental classroom visits or field trips										
Number of Parents	8	82	24	36	22	34	27	22	39	61
Total Parent Hours	6	120	43	31.5	22.5	31.5	28	24.5	102.5	143
5. Visits by teacher to parents' homes										
Number of Parents	4	3	5	5	1	3	20	2	3	0
Total Parent Hours	3.5	2.5	4.0	3.5	0.5	2	14	2	2.5	0

All Day Kindergarten teachers attended four inservice meetings during the school year. The topics and dates of these meetings were as follows: (a) The Opening Conference on September 8, 1987; (b) The Whole Language Approach to Reading, November 5, 1987; (c) Self Concept, December 15, 1987; and (d) Whole Language Approach to Reading, December 16, 1987. The General Inservice Evaluation Form was completed by participants at the meetings. The responses of the All Day Kindergarten group are summarized in Table 8. The rating scale key is as follows: (1) SD = strongly disagree; (2) D = disagree; (3) U = undecided; (4) A = agree; and (5) SA = strongly agree. As Table 8 indicates, the ADK teachers attending the meeting agree that the information presented would assist them in their program.

Table 8

Average Responses and Response Frequencies
for Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Responses SD (1)	D (2)	U (3)	A (4)	SA (5)
I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	63	4.7	0	1	1	16	46
The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	64	4.6	0	1	2	20	41
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	64	4.6	0	0	3	19	42
Questions were answered adequately.	13	4.6	0	1	3	17	42

It should be noted that the Opening Conference Evaluation Form was specifically designed to address concerns regarding the Opening Conference Inservice. For more detailed accounts of the evaluation, the reader is referred to the ECIA Chapter 1 report of the Opening Conference Inservice which was submitted to the Department of State and Federal Programs, Columbus Public Schools.

The visitation plan called for the Chapter 1 evaluator to visit program teachers in selected schools and record their perceptions on the Evaluator's Visitation Log. Visitation occurred during the period from March 1 to March 28, 1988.

The data indicated no major problems regarding selection, testing procedures, evaluation feedback, facilities, space, or materials. All teachers (8) interviewed indicated that the level of communication with cooperating teachers was very good; coordinating instruction for the reading program was rated as very important and generally occurred on an informal basis. The data indicated that 7 (87.5%) of the program teachers rated the degree of parent response to efforts at parent involvement as not as successful as desired. All teachers (8) responding indicated a desire that more inservice meetings be held during the year to enhance their instructional and professional skills. However, all interviewed (8) stated that the program had goals and objectives, with each having varying interpretations and utilizing diverse strategies to see them attained.

For a more detailed account of the evaluation, the reader is referred to the ECIA Chapter 1 Report of School Visitations to All Day Kindergarten Classrooms, 1987-88, which was submitted to the Department of State and Federal Programs, Columbus Public Schools.

Summary/Recommendations

The All Day Kindergarten Program provided underachieving kindergarten pupils in 18 schools with an extra half day of instruction, in addition to the half day they received in a regular kindergarten classroom. The goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade. The program served a total of 594 pupils, of whom 366 met the two criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample: (a) attendance for 80% of the program days; and (b) administration of both the pretest and the posttest. The average normal curve equivalent gains of 20.3 NCE points in language is more than three times the average gain of 6.0 NCE points required to meet the evaluation objective. There is a very strong indication of success in the program's overall goal, to better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for first grade. The evaluation objective called for an average gain of 1.0 NCE point for each month of program instruction. This would amount to an average of 6.0 NCE points for the 123 days of program instruction.

The total number of program teachers was 18. The number of teachers having master's degrees was 7, or 38.9% of the teaching staff. The number of teachers having reading certification was 2, or 11.1% of the program teachers. Program teachers reported an average of 10.8 years of Title I/Chapter 1 teaching experience, and an average of 18.7 years of overall teaching experience.

An unduplicated count of approximately 679 parents were directly involved with the program. Areas of parent involvement included: (a) planning operation, and/or evaluation; (b) group meetings; (c) individual conferences; (d) classroom visits and field trips; and (e) visits by the program teacher to their homes.

Program teachers attended four inservice meetings during the school year. The meetings which were evaluated received positive ratings by program teachers. Teacher comments highlighted areas of concern and possible consideration in future inservice planning.

The program evaluator collected process data by visiting some project schools. The visitation plan called for the program evaluator to visit program teachers in selected schools and record the results of the evaluator's observations and interviews with the teacher on the Evaluator's Visitation Log. Visitation occurred during the period from March 1 to March 28, 1988. Data gathered regarding evaluation and program concerns were generally found to be satisfactory. All teachers interviewed (8) indicated that the level of communication with cooperating teachers was very good. Coordinating instruction of the reading program was rated as very important and generally occurred on an informal basis. However, 7 (87.5%) of the program teachers rated the degree of parent response to efforts at parent involvementment as being less successful than desired. Some concerns were expressed regarding the limited opportunity for inservice meetings during the year to enhance instructional and professional skills.

Based on the evaluation results, it is strongly recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1988-89 school year and that the success of the program could be increased if action were taken on the following items:

1. Program teachers should be provided more inservice meetings to: (a) encourage greater parent involvement; (b) enhance program continuity regarding goals and objectives, with emphasis on the use of program-directed instructional strategies; and (c) improve interpersonal relations among professionals, with emphasis on communication skills.

2. Program teachers should be further encouraged to support the instructional coordination efforts through the use of the Course of Study and the reading series, in order to add structure and provide direction.

3. Current research articles related to program goals and objectives should be distributed to teachers periodically to enhance instruction and provide encouragement and motivation.

4. School visitations should be continued next year. These visits provide useful information regarding instruction, evaluation, and related concerns of the program teacher.

References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters, Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Johnson, J. Report of School Visitation to All Day Kindergarten Program Classrooms, 1987-88. Interim Evaluation Report, Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools, 1988.

TEACHER NUMBER	PROGRAM CODE

STUDENT	SCHOOL	GRADE	SEX

MALE ○

FEMALE ○

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT (1 2 3)	TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE (4 5 6)	HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER WEEK

NCS Trans Optic 08 8153 32

19

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS - Columbus, Ohio PUPIL CENSUS FORM

LAST NAME _____ FIRST NAME _____ M I _____ SEX _____ TEACHER NUMBER _____

SCHOOL _____ H R _____ GRADE _____

USE A NUMBER 2 PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY WHEN MAKING CORRECTIONS.

WAS THIS A "NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING" STUDENT?

YES ★ NO ★

DID THIS PUPIL BECOME QUALIFIED FOR A SPECIAL ED. PROGRAM?

YES ★ NO ★

HOW DID YOU FEEL THIS PUPIL PROGRESSED WHILE IN YOUR PROGRAM?

MUCH PROGRESS ★ SOME PROGRESS ★ LITTLE PROGRESS ★ NO PROGRESS ★

Appendix

20

1987-88
Teacher Census Form

Social Security Number ___ ___ ___-___ ___-___ ___ ___ ___

Name_____ Program Code_____

School Assignment_____ Cost Center _____

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI (4-5)
(4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
(5) CLEAR-Middle-CAI (6-8)
(6) MIC-Elementary-CAI
(7) Pilot Math Program-Middle School

DPPF Programs:
(6) SDR (9-10)
(7) SDR-CAI (9-10)
(8) HSCA
Other (Specify)_____

[a]Number of Years of Teaching Experience_____

[b]Number of Years of Title I/Chapter 1 Teaching Experience_____

[c]I am certified in reading as indicated by the subject area on my teaching certificate.

_____Yes _____No

Highest College Degree Received_____

Full-Time Employee_____
or
Part-Time Employee_____

- - - -

CHAPTER 1 EVALUATION
PARENT INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

mailing label
goes here

Name _____

School _____

For the month of SEPTEMBER, 1987

	(A) Number of Parents	(B) Total Number of Hours
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation, and/or evaluation of your unit	_____	____.__
2. Group Meetings for Parents	_____	____.__
3. Individual Parent Conferences	_____	____.__
4. Parental Classroom Visits or Field Trips	_____	____.__
5. Visits by you to Parent Homes	_____	____.__
6. Totals	_____	____.__
7. Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents	_____	

DIRECTIONS:

1. Complete all information, fold over so back is showing, staple, and place in school mail.

2. Place a parent in only one activity for any one meeting.

3. Total hours equals the number of parents times the number of hours spent, e.g., a group meeting for 10 parents which lasts 3 hours would result in 10 parents (Column A) and 30.0 hours (Column B), 15 parent conferences each for 30 minutes would result in 15 parents and 7.5 hours. Please round all figures in Column B to the nearest half hour. Enter half hours as .5, no fractions please.

4. Item 7 - This is the number of different parents seen, not the total in 6A. If you had 16 parent conferences but 10 conferences were with the same parent, the unduplicated count is 7 parents - you saw 7 parents but had 16 conferences. Do not count a parent more than once. The figure in Item 7A can never exceed the figure for Item 6A.

Please return by Friday, October 9, 1987.

EVALSRVCS/P513/KATHY.PIF

Mailing Label Here

CHAPTER 1 EVALUATION
PARENT INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

SCHOOL YEAR ESTIMATE OF PARENTS

NON-CHAPTER 1 STUDENTS

Name _____

School _____

Activities	(A) Number of Parents	(B) Number of Parent Hours
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation, and/or evaluation of your unit (do not include Parent Advisory Council members).	_____	____.__
2. Group Meetings for Parents (do not include Parent Advisory Council meetings).	_____	____.__
3. Individual Parent Conferences	_____	____.__
4. Parental Classroom Visits or Field Trips	_____	____.__
5. Visits by you to Parent Homes	_____	____.__
Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents	_____	

DIRECTIONS: Please complete all information. Indicate a 0 if the number of parents or hours is actually zero--otherwise enter the number.

Column A (Number of Parents) lines 1-5: Please place a parent in only one activity for any one meeting.

Column B (Number of Parent Hours) lines 1-5: Indicate the sum of the hours each parent spent in an activity. For example, a group meeting with 10 parents which lasted 3 hours should result in a 10 on line 2, Column A and a 30.0 on line 2, Column B (each parent met with the teacher 3 hours and there were 10 parents). Please round all figures in Column B to the nearest half-hour. Enter half hours as .5, no fractions please.

For the Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents do not count a parent more than once (even if a parent is listed in more than one activity).

After completing all the information on this survey, fold it so the back is visible, staple, and place it in the school mail.

Thank you.

Mailing Label Here

CHAPTER 1 EVALUATION
PARENT INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

_____ ANNUAL UNDUPLICATED COUNT	IMPORTANT Enter on the line to the left the annual unduplicated count of parents you had involved in any of the Activities 1-5 below. COUNT EACH PARENT ONLY ONCE FOR THE YEAR. If you have questions regarding this count, please call Sharon Bermel at 222-3011 or bring your question(s) to the end-of-the-year inservice meeting.

COMPLETE THE REST OF THIS REPORT FOR JUNE ONLY

Activities	(A) Number of Parents	(B) Total Number of Hours
1. Parents involved in the planning, operation, and/or evaluation of your unit	_____	_____.__
2. Group Meetings for Parents	_____	_____.__
3. Individual Parent Conferences	_____	_____.__
4. Parental Classroom Visits or Field Trips	_____	_____.__
5. Visits by you to Parent Homes	_____	_____.__
6. Totals	_____	_____.__
7. Estimated Unduplicated Count of Parents	_____	

DIRECTIONS:

1. Complete all information, fold over so back is showing, staple, and place in school mail.

2. Place a parent in only one activity for any one meeting.

3. Total hours equals the number of parents times the number of hours spent, e.g., a group meeting for 10 parents which lasts 3 hours would result in 10 parents (Column A) and 30.0 hours (Column B), 15 parent conferences each for 30 minutes would result in 15 parents and 7.5 hours. Please round all figures in Column B to the nearest half hour. Enter half hours as .5, no fractions please.

4. Item 7 - This is the number of different parents seen, not the total in 6A. If you had 16 parent conferences but 10 conferences were with the same parent, the unduplicated count is 7 parents - you saw 7 parents but had 16 conferences. Do not count a parent more than once. The figure in Item 7A can never exceed the figure in Item 6A.

RETURN RIGHT AWAY BUT NO LATER THAN FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1988

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM

Inservice Topic:_____

Presenter(s):_____

Date: _____ (e.g., 03/05/88)

Session: ____a.m. and/or ____p.m.

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Reading Recovery
(3) CLEAR-Primary (Special Treatment)
(4) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(5) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
(6) CLEAR-Middle (6-8)
(7) CLEAR-Middle-CAI
(8) MIC-Elementary-CAI
(9) Math-Middle-Pilot
(10) MIC-Middle-CAI
Other (Specify)_____

DPPF Programs:
(11) SDR (9-10)
(12) SDR-CAI
(13) HSCA

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?_____

_____

_____

ECIA CHAPTER 1
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
September 8, 1987

Circle only the program you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(3) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI (4-5)
(4) CLEAR-Middle School (6-8)
(5) CLEAR-Middle-CAI (6-8)
(6) MIC-Elementary-CAI
(7) Pilot Math Program-Middle School

DPPF Programs:
(6) SDR (9-10)
(7) SDR-CAI (9-10)
(8) HSCA
Other (Specify)_____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Large Group Session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
6. Commercial Exhibits					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
7. Mini-session with main speaker					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
8. Chapter 1 mini-session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1
9. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

10. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

11. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

12. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?